



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,978	01/09/2001	Eugene Roussel	210582.0001/1US	6809

8933 7590 05/07/2003

DUANE MORRIS, LLP
ATTN: WILLIAM H. MURRAY
ONE LIBERTY PLACE
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-7396

EXAMINER

YU, MISOOK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application N . 09/756,978	Applicant(s) ROUSSEL, EUGENE	
	Examiner MISOOK YU, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1642	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MISOOK YU, Ph.D. (3) _____
 (2) Gary Colby. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 06 May 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: email sent to the examiner on 4-28-2003.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-66.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Upon review of the Office action mailed on 4-11-2003 and the amendment, Paper No. 18, supplemental office action is not needed. Applicant is told that new discovery of mechanism of action of known product in known method is not patentable subject matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

ATT705216

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THIS ELECTRONIC MAIL TRANSMISSION IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL AND I
S

INTENDED ONLY FOR THE REVIEW OF THE PARTY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED. IF
YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY RETURN

IT TO THE SENDER. UNINTENDED TRANSMISSION SHALL NOT CONSTITUTE WAIVER
OF THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT OR ANY OTHER PRIVILEGE.

-----Original Message-----

From: GDColby@duanemorris.com [mailto:GDColby@duanemorris.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 3:47 PM
To: misook.yu@uspto.gov
Cc: rssel@cs.com; anthony.caputa@uspto.gov
Subject: USSN 09/756,978

Dear Examiner Yu,

As I mentioned in my voice mail message today, the inventor for the application referenced above and I reviewed the Office Action mailed on 11 April 2003 (Paper No. 22) and believe that the obviousness rejection that you made failed to take into account the arguments that we included in our previous response regarding a potential obviousness rejection.

We would like you to reconsider the obviousness rejection in view of the particular parts of our previous response listed below.

- the overview, beginning on page 3 of our Preliminary Amendment (i.e., the response we submitted in January 2003)
- the second full paragraph on page 6 of the Preliminary Amendment
- the section of the Preliminary Amendment beginning on page 7 and continuing onto page 8 (regarding in vivo activities of the agents recited in the claims)
- discussion of Wands factor 3 on page 12 of the Preliminary Amendment
- item 38 of the Declaration of Eugene Roussel
- the recitation in claims 1 and 66, "... whereby a type 1 inflammatory response is induced in the tumor..." (i.e., where is that taught in the prior art?)
- page 6, line 21, through page 8, line 7, of the specification.

We believe that you would not have made the obviousness rejection that you made if these sections had captured your attention. Please let us know as soon as possible whether you will issue a new office action (i.e., without the obviousness rejection) at your earliest convenience.

This electronic mail message is NOT authorization to transmit any substantive responses to my firm or our client by electronic mail. I have sent this message electronically simply to try to hasten reconsideration of the last office action. I would prefer that you respond to this message by telephoning me, and thereafter as normal - in writing.

I appreciate your consideration of this issue and look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

Gary

Gary D. Colby, Ph.D., J.D.
Duane Morris LLP
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia PA 19103-7396
215.979.1849
215.979.1020 fax
GDColby@DuaneMorris.com
<http://www.duanemorris.com/>